

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Formalities

The claims and specification have been revised to place the application in proper U.S. format and to correct a few minor grammatical and idiomatic errors, including correction of the error in the dependency of claim 10 noted in both items 1 and 2 of the Official Action.

Because the changes are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that the changes do not involve new matter.

2. Rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 16 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,952,995 (Barnes)

This rejection has been rendered moot by the amendment of:

- claim 1 to include the limitations of original claims 2 and 3; and
- claim 11 (from which claim 16 depends) to include the limitations of original claim 12.

3. Rejection of Claims 6-8 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,734,689 (Kurakake)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Kurakake patent fails to disclose or suggest a screen scrolling method in which, when the cursor is within a predetermined region of the active window, the window is scrolled in the moving direction of the cursor, and furthermore, in which:

- the scrolling distance is a **half page**; and
- **after** scrolling the window by a half page, the cursor is placed at a **middle position** of the window being scrolled.

According to the Examiner, col. 11 of the Kurakake patent discloses a half page scroll. However, col. 11 describes a single line scroll. As explained in col. 11, lines 34-37, “[w]hen the cursor has reached the uppermost line, the screen scrolls downward and the data leaves the screen **line by line** from the lower end thereof.” Similarly, as explained in col. 11, lines 57-60, “[w]hen the cursor has reached the lower-most end of the screen, the displayed data is scrolled upward again and leaves the upper end of the screen **line by line**.” Nowhere does the Kurakake patent disclose scrolling the window by an entire half page when the cursor nears the edge of the screen.

In addition, the Examiner will note that in the embodiment of col. 11 of Kurakake, the cursor is “*retained*” at the position that cause line-by-line scrolling, namely the 3<sup>rd</sup> line from the top. On the other hand, in an *alternative* embodiment described in cols. 4 *et seq.*, the cursor is simply held at the center of the screen during scrolling. In **neither** embodiment is the cursor moved to the edge of the screen, **after** which the cursor is moved back to the center of the screen. This is because the scroll of Kurakake is a line-by-line or continuous scroll, and not a half page scroll of the type claimed.

To the extent that the Kurakake patent discloses centering of the cursor, the cursor moves **during** the scroll, and not **after** a scroll has been completed, as in the claimed invention. As explained in col. 4, lines 41-44, “[u]nless a document to be displayed corresponds to an ending or starting portion of a page, the screen scrolling operation is performed **while the cursor remains at the screen center**. In the embodiment described in col. 4 of Kurakake, the cursor never moves away from the center of the screen, and thus can never be moved out of a predetermined region of the active window. On the other hand, in the embodiment described in col. 11 of Kurakake, the scrolling occurs when the cursor is moved to the edge of the active window (out of a predetermined region), but the cursor is not returned to the center of the screen.

None of the embodiments of the Kurakake method involves the claimed combination of (i) initiating scrolling by moving the cursor out of a predetermined region (*i.e.*, towards the edge

of the screen), (ii) causing a half page scroll to occur, and (iii) moving the cursor back to the center of the screen after the half page scroll, as claimed.

As a result of the above-described differences, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-8 (now combined into claim 6) under 35 USC §102(b) in view of the Kurakake patent is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claims 2 and 3 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,952,995 (Barnes) and 4,734,689 (Kurakake)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Barnes and Kurakake patents fail to disclose or suggest whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, a screen scrolling method in which, if the cursor is within a predetermined region of the active window, the window is scrolled in the moving direction of the cursor, and furthermore, in which:

- the scrolling distance is a **half page**; and
- **after** scrolling the window by a half page, the cursor is placed at a **middle position** of the window being scrolled.

The Barnes patent, as acknowledged by the Examiner, clearly fails to disclose half page scrolling. Furthermore, as discussed above, the Kurakake patent alternatively teaches scrolling with the cursor fixed at the center of the page, rather than being moved there after a half-page scroll, or the cursor remaining at the bottom or top of the screen during a line by line scroll, and therefore also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed combination of half page scrolling and movement of the cursor back to the center of the screen after a scroll to enable the half page scrolling to occur (if the cursor stayed at the top and bottom of the screen as in Kurakake, scrolling would have to be continuous and not by half page increments).

Since neither Barnes nor Kurakake discloses the claimed combination of half page scrolling in response to movement of the cursor out of a predetermined area, and movement of

the cursor back to the center of the screen following a half-page scroll, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 3 (now included in claim 1) under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the Barnes and Kurakake patents is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,952,995 (Barnes) and 5,333,247 (Gest)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Gest patent, like the Barnes patent, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, a screen scrolling method in which the scrolling distance is a half page; and the cursor is not returned to the middle position of the window being scrolled until **after** a half-page scroll has been performed. Instead, the Gest patent discloses a scrolling method in which scrolling may either be on a **line-by-line** basis or a **full-window** basis (col. 8, lines 38-56), as opposed to a half-page, and in which there is no suggestion of moving the cursor to the center of the new page **after** the scrolling has occurred.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the Barnes and Gest patents is improper, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejections of Claims 5, 9, 10, and 12-15 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of Various Combinations of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,952,995 (Barnes), 5,333,247 (Gest), and 4,734,689 (Kurakake)

This rejection is also respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Kurakake, Gest and Barnes patents, for the reasons described above, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, a screen scrolling method in which the scrolling distance is a half page; and the cursor is not returned to the middle position of the window being scrolled until **after** a half-page scroll has been performed, as recited in claims 9 and 13, or the half-page scroll recited in claim 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the various rejections of claims 9, 13, and 14 under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the Barnes, Gest, and/or Kurakake patents are all improper, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Serial Number 10/092,913

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Urcia', followed by a long horizontal line.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: June 18, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB\S3\Producer\ben\Fending A...1\BUTMSE11 092913\01.wpd